

Appl. No. 10/042,702  
Amtd dated July 12, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated March 10 2004

### **REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS**

#### **Oath/Declaration**

The Examiner has requested clarification of the family and given name of the inventor. The family name of the inventor is Ma and his given name is Fan Yung.

#### **Objections to Drawings**

The drawings are objected to by the Examiner. In particular, Fig. 1 should be designated by a legend such as -- prior art -- since only that which is old is illustrated. In response, Applicant has amended Fig. 1 to include the label "prior art". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

#### **Rejection under 35 USC § 112**

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the limitation "the second state" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to provide sufficient antecedent basis for "the second state". As such, Applicant submits that this basis of rejection to claim 1 has been traversed and requests its withdrawal.

#### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending Application No. 10/250,253. In response, Applicant has submitted with this amendment a terminal disclaimer

Appl. No. 10/042,702  
Amdt dated July 12, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated March 10 2004

in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Therefore, Applicant submits that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection to claim 1 has been overcome and respectfully requests its withdrawal.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner would allow claim 1 if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph and a proper terminal disclaimer is filed. Applicant submits that both requirements have been fulfilled, and as such, claim 1 is now allowable.

#### New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 2-18 by way of this response. Claims 2 and 18 recite a fuse cell which includes a latch, a control circuit, and a fuse circuit. In response to an input signal at the input terminal of the fuse cell, the control circuit causes the fuse cell to operate in either the normal or initialization mode. In the normal mode of operation, the latch is either in a first or second latch state depending on the fuse state, causing an output signal at the output terminal to be either in a first or second output signal state to indicate that the fuse is in the cut or uncut state. Applicant submits that the cited art of record, including references cited in the information disclosure statement filed on July 8, 2004, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the fuse cell as recited in claim 2. Therefore, claims 2 and 18 are patentable over the cited art of record. Since claims 3-17 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 2, these claims are also patentable.

Appl. No. 10/042,702  
Amdt dated July 12, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated March 10 2004

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned attorney at his number set out below.

Date: July 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter CHIN  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 38,842

Horizon IP Pte Ltd  
166 Kallang Way, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Singapore 349249  
Tel.: (65) 9836 9908  
Fax: (65) 6746 8263